

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030587US1
Serial No. 10/666,815
Response to Office Action mailed February 28, 2007

II. REMARKS

1. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The examiner rejected claim 23 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 24 into claim 23 so that claim is no longer a single means claim.
2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The examiner rejected claims 1-5, 6-123, 14, 16-18, 20, 22, 25-27, 29, 31 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended each independent claim to create an antecedent basis for the copied database script.
3. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The examiner rejected claims 23-31 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 23-31 to remove the basis for the rejection.
4. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-20, 22-29, and 31 as being anticipated by Heiny (US 5,778,356).

The difference is applicant translates an entire database, whereas Heiny discloses a system that is already set up and translated. As will be explained further below, Heiny cannot translate a database without specific requirements that are not present in applicant's invention.

Heiny requires at least an international string parameter, an international string list, and a plurality of handles linked to a plurality of character strings. The international string parameter must have a pointer to the international string list. Each item on the international string list must

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030587US1
Serial No. 10/666,815
Response to Office Action mailed February 28, 2007

have a handle linked to a plurality of character strings in different languages. Thus, once such a system is set up, Heiny can translate objects in a database script written in a source language into a variety of target languages, but only if the structure is created as disclosed by Heiny.

Applicant, on the other hand, discloses a system for translating a database that requires only a translation database containing script terms and their translations. Applicant's disclosure foresees that not all terms may be found in the translation database, and manual translation is required in such cases. Applicant uses no pointers or handles. Rather, applicant copies the database script to be translated, marks the text strings with a label, creates a label file which is a list of all of the text strings associated with the label, translates the text strings, and then substitutes the translated string texts for the label so that when the database script is run, it will produce a translated database script. With the exception of terms that cannot match up with a translation and that have to be manually translated, applicant has provided an automated method for translating a database script using only a few steps and a translation database.

Applicant's method contrasts starkly with the system disclosed by Heiny, where the translation of the database depends on the use of Heiny's "international string parameters" with the pointers built in and the pre-prepared international string list with handles and links already in place. Applicant's method can be applied to any database script without using pre-prepared parameters, pointers, and links. Applicant requires only a translation database to execute his method and to create a translated database.

5. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The examiner rejected claims 6, 13, 21, and 30 as being unpatentable over Heiny in view of Raz et al. (US5,852,715).

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030587US1
Serial No. 10/666,815
Response to Office Action mailed February 28, 2007

Applicant submits, that copying is not obvious because the purpose of the copying is to create a new working database script which will become the translated data base script after being acted on by applicant's invention. Such is not the disclosure of Raz.

6. Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


Rudolf O. Siegesmund

Registration No. 37,720

Gordon & Rees LLP

Suite 2800

2100 Ross Avenue

Dallas, Texas 75201

214-231-4660

214-461-4053 (fax)

rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com